DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 239 799 RC 014 554

AUTHOR Whitener, Leslie A.
TITLE Hired Farm Labor Data from the Decennial Census: Limitations and Considerations.
PUB DATE Aug 83
NOTE 25p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Rural Sociological Society (Lexington, KY, August 17-20, 1983).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement; *Census Figures; *Comparative Analysis; Educational Background; Employment Level; *Error Patterns; Family Income; Family Size; *Farm Labor; Low Income; Multivariate Analysis; Occupational Surveys; *Participant Characteristics; Place of Residence; Research Problems; Rural Population; *Seasonal Laborers; Socioeconomic Status; Statistical Data; Statistical Significance
IDENTIFIERS *Hired Farm Working Force Survey

ABSTRACT

One limitation of hired farm labor data from the Decennial Census is undercounting; the seasonal nature of farm work means that many farm laborers are not employed in March, when the Census is taken. The 1981 Hired Farm Working Force Survey provided data to evaluate the usefulness of Census data for farm labor research. Data were grouped into farmworkers employed during March (representing the hired farmworker population measured by the Census) and farmworkers employed at other times of year and therefore excluded from Census farm labor categories. Step-wise discriminant analysis was used to determine whether the groups differed significantly by demographic, employment, educational, and economic characteristics. Of 20 variables used, 15 were statistically significant discriminators between the groups, with farm earnings and hired farmwork as the major activity during the year being the two most significant. March farmworkers were generally those committed to and economically dependent on hired farmwork for most of the year. However, almost one-third cited nonfarm work or not in the labor force as their primary activity during the year; they would not identify with farmwork as an occupation. About 9% of the other month workers cited hired farmwork as their major activity, yet would not be included in Census data as farmworkers. (MH)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

ED239799

RC

# HIRED FARM LABOR DATA FROM THE DECENNIAL CENSUS: LIMITATIONS AND CONSIDERATIONS

Leslie A. Whitener
Economic Research Service
U.S. Department of Agriculture

Paper to be presented at the annual meeting
of the Rural Sociological Society
Lexington, Kentucky
August 17-20, 1983

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

RC014554

# HIRED FARM LABOR DATA FROM THE DECENNIAL CENSUS: LIMITATIONS AND CONSIDERATIONS

by

Leslie A. Whitener
Economic Research Service
U.S. Department of Agriculture

## INTRODUCTION

Farm labor data from the Decennial Censuses are periodically used in research on labor market structure (Gilroy, 1975; Brown and O'Leary, 1979); labor force stratification (Zuiches and Brown, 1978; Sommers, 1974); occupational segregation and inequality (Wolf and Fligstein, 1979); and occupational structure and distribution (DiCesare, 1975; Hathaway, Beegle, and Bryant, 1968; Hathaway, 1965). However, certain limitations and restrictions must be considered when using these data. Census occupational codes are determined from the respondent's primary work activity in the week prior to completing the Census questionnaire, generally the last week of March. Because of the seasonal nature of agriculture, many farmworkers are excluded from the Decennial Census farm labor categories if they were not working on farms in March. These exclusions suggest a significant undercounting and indicate caution in the use of Census farm labor data for some purposes.

Census data are useful for comparing occupational groups since data on a large number of occupations are uniformly collected at one point in time. However, problems arise when these data are used to describe work activities which are characterized by seasonality and a high degree of labor turnover. Agricultural work is particularly susceptible to this problem since many persons who do hired farm work during the year are not

employed on farms at the time the Census is taken.

According to the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Hired Farm Working Force (HFWF) Survey, only about one-third of the hired farmworkers who worked on farms at sometime during 1981 were employed on farms during March. Instead, hired farmworkers were more likely to have worked during the summer months of June through September. Thus, Census data, which count only those working in March, may be missing as many as two-thirds of the Nation's hired farmworkers. This exclusion suggests that the characteristics of March workers portrayed in Census data could be misleading for generalizations about U.S. farm labor.

This paper uses data from the 1981 Hired Farm Working Force Survey to evaluate the usefulness of Census data for farm labor research. [1] The analysis focuses on two groups of workers: (1) those that did hired farmwork during March and most closely represent the hired farmworker population measured by the Decennial Census and (2) those that were employed at other times of the year and were therefore excluded from the Census farm labor categories. This paper describes the socioeconomic characteristics of each group and utilizes a step-wise discriminant analysis procedure to determine if the two groups of farmworkers differ significantly by demographic and economic characteristics. The coefficients provided give an indication of the relative importance of variables in differentiating between groups. The paper then discusses the implictions of these findings for farm labor research.

---

[1] Detailed occupational data from the Census, including data on farm labor have not yet been released and are expected to be available from Summary Tape File 4 (STF 4) in late 1983. Information on major occupational groupings, i.e. Farming, Forestry and Fisheries, is currently available from STF 3.

## LITERATURE REVIEW

Decennial data are used frequently in research comparing various occupational groups. Sommers (1974), for example, used 1970 Census data to rank occupations, including farm laborer, by median earnings, and to examine the effects of age, education, and full-year employment on earnings of men and women. DiCesare (1975) utilized 1960 and 1970 Census data to examine occupational employment trends and the changing sex composition of occupations, including farmworkers. Other studies used Census data to examine employment and occupational change over time focusing on such characteristics as region, race, residence, sex, and proximity to SMSA (Hathaway, Beegle, and Bryant, 1968; Zuiches and Brown, 1978; Brown and O'Leary, 1979). Research on occupational segregation has utilized Census data to classify occupations as primarily male or female (Wolf and Fligstein, 1979), while other studies calculated indices of dissimilarity to measure differences in occupational distributions by sex (Rogers and Goudy, 1981).

## THE DATA

The data for this study were obtained in December of 1981 from the biennial Hired Farm Working Force Survey conducted for the Economic Research Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture by the Bureau of the Census as a supplementary part of the Current Population Survey (CPS) (Bureau of Census, 1963; Pollack and Jackson, 1983). The CPS sample includes approximately 58,000 occupied households. About 1,536 households contained at least one hired farmworker. The sample includes areas in

every State and the District of Columbia but excludes Puerto Rico and other U.S. territories and possessions.[2]

The Current Population Survey is a stratified multi-stage area probability sample. Case weights (expansion factors) are applied to sample results to derive independent estimates of the U.S. civilian noninstitutional population by age, race, and sex. This resulted in an estimated 2,492,000 hired farmworkers in 1981. However, statistical significance is relatively easy to achieve with a large number of cases because of an artificial reduction in variance and standard error estimates. Thus, it is almost always possible to reject the null hypothesis of no difference, even for a very slight relationship (Blalock, 1972). To avoid this problem the case weights were adjusted so that the number of cases was reduced to the original sample size and the compositions of both the expanded data and the adjusted data were identical. All analysis in this paper is based on the adjusted data.

Table 1 lists the agricultural-related occupations reported in the 1980 Census. The data from the Hired Farm Working Force Survey most closely approximate those Census categories of managers, supervisors, farmworkers, and nursery workers indicated by asterisks on table 1.[3]

---

Table 1 about here

---

[2]While there are no estimates on the numbers of undocumented foreign workers in the sample, this group generally avoids contact with Government officials and most are probably not included in the survey population. Also, documented foreign nationals who did hired farmwork in this country and returned to their homes before the field collection are not included.

[3]Only the hired segment of these groupings would be included in the definition of hired farm labor used in this paper.

Data from the Hired Farm Working Force Survey indicate that there were 2.5 million persons 14 years of age and over who did farmwork[4] for cash wages or salary at some time during the year, even if only for one day. For purposes of comparability with Decennial Census data, however, this population was reduced to include only those workers 16 years of age and over. Approximately 210,000 persons 14-15 years old (11 percent of the total) were excluded from the analysis.

Data from the Hired Farm Working Force Survey are collected biennially and were not available for the 1980 Census year. However, a comparison of the 1979 and 1981 survey data show that the basic employment and demographic characteristics did not change significantly during this period, suggesting that the 1981 data closely approximate 1980 figures.

## FINDINGS

### March Workers: The Included Population

Agricultural dependence. March workers in general appear to identify closely with farmwork as an occupation. About 68 percent of hired farmworkers employed in March were also employed in at least nine other months during the year. Over one-half did farmwork in all twelve months of 1981; only 2 perent worked solely in March. March workers did more than

[4]Farmwork is defined as work done on a farm for cash wages in connection with the production, harvesting, and delivery of agricultural commodities, as well as management of a farm if done for cash wages. Exchange work, work done by the farm operator or his family without pay, custom work, or work done exclusively for pay in kind are not included.

just a few days of work each month, they averaged over 200 days of farmwork during the year (table 2). The largest proportions of the March employed workers lived in the South and West and most were employed in field crops, livestock, or dairy production during their longest farm job.[5] These activities often require continuous full-time committment unlike much of the fruit and vegetable work which requires a large amount of labor for short periods of time.

---

Table 2 about here

---

In 1981, March workers on the average earned $6,979 from all sources, with over $6,000 from farmwork alone. Thus, March workers depended on agriculture for 89 percent of their earnings. Most of these workers had no other job but farmwork. Only one-fourth did any nonfarm work during the year and the majority of these worked less than 150 days at their nonfarm jobs.

March workers identified their own degree of attachment to agriculture by responding to a question concerning principal activity during the year. Over 70 percent cited hired farmwork as their major activity while the remainder indicated they were engaged primarily in nonfarm work, were unemployed, or were attending school, keeping house,

---

[5] Major crop and livestock activity was determined from a question concerning the crops or livestock which the respondent worked with most on the farm where he/she worked the greatest number of days in 1981. Response categories were coded into (1) field crops, including grains, cotton, tobacco, and other field crops; (2) fruits and vegetables, including vegetables and melons, fruits, or tree nuts; (3) livestock, including beef cattle, dairy, poultry and eggs, and other livestock; (4) other, including nursery or tree crops and other.

or were otherwise not in the labor force most of the year.

Demographic composition. March workers were generally in the prime working years of 25 to 55, with an average age of 34 years, and were likely to be household heads or spouses (table 3). A large proportion of the March workers were probably largely responsible for their families' support. The majority were male (89 percent) and married (58 percent), and had an average family size of 4. Since farmwork is a major source of earnings for most March workers, their characteristics suggest that the families of March workers are largely dependent on agriculture for the major source of family income.

---

Table 3 about here

---

Economic and educational status. In general, hired farmworkers are considered to be one of the more economically and educationally disadvantaged groups of workers. They are described as having few labor market skills, little education, and little opportunity for employment in higher skilled, higher wage occupations (Marshall, 1974; Whitener Smith and Coltrane, 1981). The data on March workers give credence to these assumptions. In 1981, March workers received about $7,000 from all sources (mostly from farmwork) compared with over $13,000 received by all U.S. nonagricultural private sector production workers. However, earnings data should not be used alone to define farmworkers' economic well-being. Family income and family size must also be considered. Using a modification of the official Federal poverty criteria in 1981 (U.S. Bureau

of Census, 1983) as an indicator of low income status,[6] about 31 percent of March farmworkers were in low income families. Among minority March workers, low income was even more widespread. Hispanic and black and other workers comprised about 17 percent each of all March workers.[7] Yet almost 45 percent of the Hispanics and over half of the blacks and others were in low income families, compared with only 25 percent of the white workers.

Home ownership is also an indicator of economic status. Less than one-half of the March workers owned or were buying their own home or lived with a family that did. The remainder was renting or living in a domicile that did not require cash rent.

The low economic status of March farmworkers compared to other U.S. workers is probably a result of a strong dependence on relatively low agricultural earnings, and limited skills and opportunities for higher-paying nonfarm jobs. Low levels of education may contribute to these workers' dependence on low-wage jobs. In 1981, March workers had completed an average 9.6 years of school, but there were differences by racial/ethnic group. Hispanic workers had completed an average 5.9 years of schooling; blacks and others had completed an average of 8.4 years; and whites had

---

[6] This low income measure was based on the following family size and income criteria. Families with annual incomes below these threshholds were considered to be economically disadvantaged for purposes of this study.

| Family size | Family income |
|---|---|
| 1 | $4,999 |
| 2 | 5,999 |
| 3 | 7,499 |
| 4 | 9,999 |
| 5-6 | 11,999 |
| 7 | 14,999 |

[7] Racial/ethnic groups are classified into three mutually exclusive groups based on a self-identification question. The groups are white, Hispanic, and black and other. For purposes of later analysis, this variable is coded into minorities=1 and whites=0.

completed 11.1 years.

## Workers in Other Months: The Excluded Population

Agriculture dependence. Unlike March workers, farmworkers in other months tended to be seasonal workers and the data reviewed below indicate they had a relatively weak attachment to hired farmwork.

--Three-fourths worked for less than 3 months during the year, generally in the summer months of June through August; they averaged 39 days of farmwork in 1981.

--Over one-half were not in the labor force most of the year and the majority of these were students. Another 25 percent cited nonfarm work as their major activity and used farmwork for supplemental earnings. Less than 10 percent cited hired farmwork as their major activity during the year.

--These workers averaged $3,448 in total earnings with $1,070 from farmwork. Their agricultural dependency rate was high (61 percent of total earnings came from farmwork), but this was largely because almost one-half had no other earnings source but farmwork.

--They accounted for three-fourths of all hired farmworkers in 1981, but did only one-fourth of the total 232 million days worked on farms.

Demographic Composition. Demographically, other month workers tended to be young (almost 60 percent under 25), white (76 percent), and male (71 percent). They were most likely to be single and household members other than the head. A large proportion were students and homemakers. The majority lived in nonfarm places and most either owned their own home or lived with a family that did. The largest proportions lived in the North

Central or Southern states.

Economic Status. Workers in other months generally do farmwork on a casual basis and most are probably not largely responsible for their own or their families' support. In 1981, these workers received an average of $3,448 in total earnings with about 61 percent from hired farmwork. The average family income of other month workers was $16,259, slightly above that of March workers ($14,329). However, both groups were considerably below the U.S. average for all families ($25,838). Based on family size and income data, almost a third of other month workers were living in low-income families. This proportion was similar to that of March workers.

## Multivariate Analysis: Do the Groups Differ?

Do March and other month workers differ significantly from each other? If so, what variables account for the differences between the two groups? Which variables are most important in differentiating March workers from other workers?

The one-way analysis of variance presented in tables 2 and 3 clearly show significant differences between March workers and others in terms of demographic, employment, and economic characteristics. Of the variables examined in the tables, only the means for residence in the South, low income status, and work with fruits and vegetables did not show significant differences between the groups.

Since the analyses of variance do not take into account the intercorrelations among variables, a step- wise discriminant analysis procedure was used to simultaneously examine demographic and employment variables and determine if the two groups differed significantly on a set

of variables (Klecka, 1980; Tatsuoka, 1971). Also, the discriminant analysis helps to identify those variables which are most important in differentiating the two groups. The results of this analysis are presented in table 4.

---

Table 4 about here

---

Mean data reported in tables 2 and 3 focus on 11 demographic variables and 12 employment-related items. Three of these 23 variables were eliminated prior to conducting the discriminant analysis. Days of nonfarm work and nonfarm earnings were deleted because information was not available for all cases (about 42 percent of hired workers did not do any nonfarm work) and the sample size would have been reduced considerably. Days of farmwork was not included in the analysis because of the high correlation with farm earnings. From the set of 20 variables entered into the discriminant procedure, 15 proved to be statistically significant discriminators of the two groups of farmworkers. Total earnings, home ownership, residence in the West, minority status, and nonfarm work as chief activity, were not significantly different from zero at the .01 level after controlling for other variables and these items were removed from the estimated discriminant function.[8] Also, three variables not important in

---

[8]Variables were deemed significant and entered into (or retained) in the discriminant function if its F values, taking account of other variables in the function, indicated a 1 percent level of significance. Results of the discriminant analyses are affected by the intercorrelations between variables included in the functions. However, correlations among variables did not exceed .60 and most were under .50.

tables 2 and 3 (low income status, work with fruits and vegetables, and residence in the South) were judged to be significant factors in the discriminant analysis.

Based on the variables included in the function, the group centroid (mean) for March workers falls toward the positive end (1.34) and other month workers are at the negative end (-.79). These data suggest a clear differentiation between the two groups. The discriminant function is moderately successful in distinguishing between the groups as indicated by an eigenvalue of 1.014, the canonical correlation of .716, and the ability of the function to correctly classify 84 percent of the sample cases.

The variables in the discriminant function are ranked according to the relative magnitude of the standardized coefficients. These coefficients indicate the relative importance of each variable in much the same way as do beta weights in a regression equation. The standardized coefficients indicate that workers in March and workers in other months differ most on farm earnings and hired farmwork as the major activity during the year. They differ to a lesser degree on residence in the South, work with field crops, agricultural dependence, and not in the labor force as chief activity. Using the group centroids along with the discriminant function coefficients, March workers can be described as having higher earnings than other month workers and a higher dependency on agriculture. They are more likely than others to cite hired farmwork as their major activity and less likely to cite not in the labor force. March workers are also more likely to live in the South than workers in other months.

The economic and employment variables appear to be most useful in differentiating between groups. Most of the demographic variables (age, education, nonfarm residence, low income status, sex, household status)

are significant but contribute relatively little to the function. In fact, these demographic variables alone explain only 15 percent of the variation between the groups. With the addition of the economic variables, the function accounts for 51 percent of the variance between groups. However, this does not mean that the demographic variables are unimportant. Clearly, they are useful for differentiating between March and other month workers and for describing the compositions of these groups.

## SUMMARY AND IMPLICATIONS

The Decennial Census data have some clear advantages over other sources of farm labor data. The Census of Population is the only complete enumeration of the national labor force, including categories for farm labor. It offers geographic detail not available in other data sources and provides a variety of information for all States, counties and other areas within States, and various categorizations of place of residence. Census farm labor data also offer the advantage of historical comparability, at least at the broadest classification level, and efforts are being made to describe and improve the comparability at more detailed occupational levels.[9] Finally, Census data are invaluable for examining characteristics of different occupational categories. However, at the same time, there are serious limitations which must be considered in using Census farm labor data.

---

[9]The 1980 Census adopted a new occupational classification scheme which greatly affects historical comparability for many occupations (Bregger, 1982; Green et al., 1983). However, efforts are underway to standardize occupational data for previous Census years based on 1980 classification codes (Nie et al., 1982).

Census occupational data are generally used under the assumption that workers are attached to that occupation on a year-round basis. This implies that the basic characteristics of workers in an occupational group would be similar regardless of the month of data collection. However, these assumptions cannot be extended to all hired farmworkers. Data on March workers generally describe those farmworkers who are committed to and economically dependent on hired farmwork for most of the year. Yet, almost one-third of these workers cited nonfarm work or not in the labor force as their primary activity during the year. These workers would not identify with farmwork as an occupation. At the same time, about 9 percent of the other month workers cited hired farmwork as their major activity yet the Census data do not include these workers in the farm labor categories. Thus, Census data do not perfectly measure farmworkers from an occupational perspective which focuses on those workers who are committed to and dependent on a particular work activity.

Also, Census data are often used to describe an occupational category in terms of the total labor force involved in that particular activity. Census data are useful for identifying the numbers and characteristics of physicians or economists, for example, since the data probably vary little from month to month. However, because of the seasonality of labor use in agriculture and the high labor turnover of farmworkers, Census data collected in March could exclude as many as two-thirds of all hired farmworkers. Also, the socioeconomic characteristics of the March workers differ considerably from those of workers in other months. Thus, Census data are not useful for examining farm laborers from a total labor force perspective.

HFWF data for March workers, used as a proxy for Census data, charac-

terize hired farmworkers as a group of workers who are economically dependent on agriculture. They are generally white, male, household heads, who have low levels of education and work mostly in field, livestock, or dairy production. They are most likely to live in nonfarm places, in the South, and are not likely to own their own home. They are highly dependent on their farmwork and most have no other source of earnings.

However, if March workers are combined with all other month workers, these generalities would change, and in some cases, patterns would reverse. With the addition of the other month workers, the average worker becomes younger and more educated. He/she is more likely to be white and less likely to be a household head. The employment and economic variables are affected even more. Because of their strong attachment to farmwork, March workers report higher farm earnings than the other month workers. When the other month workers are added with the March workers, overall averages for farm earnings, as well as for total earnings, days of farmwork, and agricultural dependence, decrease to reflect the influx of the more seasonal workers. Thus, an occupational concept based on Census data in March and a labor force supply concept which includes all persons doing hired farmwork during the year provide two significantly different descriptions of U.S. farmworkers.

These findings suggest that research using Census farm labor data would have different study results if the data were modified to include all workers. For example, if Sommer (1974) had used data for all hired farmworkers in his study of occupational rankings, the median earnings of farmworkers would still be ranked toward the bottom of the occupational list, although there might be slight shifts with other low-paying occupations. However, Sommer also examined the effects of age, education,

and duration of employment on the median earnings of the occupation groups. Had she included all farmworkers in her analysis, the effects of the variables on median earnings could have sigificantly changed her results because all farmworkers are younger, have more years of education, and spend less time doing farmwork than farmworkers reported by the Census.

Research findings on historical occupational trends could also be affected. While the number of hired farmworkers has been relatively stable over the decade of the 1970s, this stability has not been evident in all segments of the farm work force. Between 1970 and 1981, the number of regular and year-round workers who worked 150 days or more showed a significant increase of 47 percent. This trend should be reflected in analysis of 1970-1980 Census data. However, this increase was partially offset by declines in the numbers of casual and seasonal workers doing less than 75 days of farmwork. This pattern would not be visible in the Census data and it is possible that 1980 Census data will show an increase over 1970 in the number of all hired farmworkers instead of the more stabilized pattern shown by data from the Hired Farm Working Force Survey. Since the characteristics and employment patterns of all segments of the hired farm work force do not change consistently, historical analysis based on Census data may obscure important patterns and trends relating to hired farmworkers.

Thus, farm labor data from the decennial Census require careful use and explicit caveats as to which group is being measured and what implications this has for farm labor in general. Census data, improperly used, could lead us to believe that farm workers are a relatively settled, committed, year-round work force with demographic and economic characteristics that reflect an occupational commitment to agriculture.

This is clearly not the case.

## REFERENCES


Blalock, Hubert M., Jr.
1972 Social Statistics. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Brown, David L., and Jeanne M. O'Leary
1979 Labor Force Activity of Women in Metropolitan and Nonmetropolitan America. Rural Development Research Report No. 15. Washington, D.C.:Economics, Statistics, and Cooperatives Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture. September.

Bregger, John E.
1982 "Labor force data from the CPS to undergo revision in January 1983." Monthly Labor Review. November. 105(11):3-6.

DiCesare, Constance Rogh
1975 "Changes in the occupational structure of U.S. jobs." Monthly Labor Review. March. 98(3):24-34.

Green, Gloria P., Khoan tan Dinh, John A. Priebe, Ronald R. Tucker
1983 "Revisions in the Current Population Survey beginning in January 1983." Monthly Labor Review. February. 106(2):7-15.

Gilroy, Curtis L.
1975 "Investment in human capital and Black-White unemployment." Monthly Labor Review. July. 98(7):13-21.

Hathaway, Dale E.
1967 "Occupational mobility from the farm labor force," in C.E. Bishop(ed.), Farm Labor in the United States. New York: Columbia.

_____,J.A. Beegle and W.K. Bryant
1968 People of Rural America. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Klecka, William R.
1980 Discriminant Analysis. Beverly Hills, CA:Sage.

Marshall, Ray
1974 Rural Workers in Rural Labor Markets. Salt Lake City, Utah: Olympus Publishing.

Nam, Charles B., Robert Parke, Thomas Scopp
1982 "Historical comparability of occupation statistics: Report of a project." Proceedings of the American Statistical Association.

Pollack, Susan L. and William R. Jackson, Jr.
1983 The Hired Farm Working Force of 1981. Washington, D.C.:Economic Research Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Rogers, David L. and Willis J. Goudy
1981 "Community structure and occupational segregation, 1960 and 1970. Rural Sociology. 46(Summer):263-281.

Sommers, Dianne
1974 "Occupational rankings of men and women by earnings," Monthly Labor Review. August. 97(8):34-51.

Tatsuoka, Maurice M.
1971 Multivariate Analysis. New York: Wiley and Sons.

Whitener Smith, Leslie and Robert Coltrane
1981 Hired Farmworkers: Background and Trends for the Eighties. RDRR No. 32. Washington, D.C.: Economic Research Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture. September.

Wolf, Wendy and Neil Fligstein
1979 "Sex and authority in the workplace: The causes of sexual inequality". American Sociological Review. 44(April):235-252.

U.S. Bureau of Census
1963 The Current Population Survey--A Report on Methodology. Paper No. 7. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

---
1983 Characteristics of the Population Below the Poverty Level: 1981. Current Population Reports. P-60, No. 138. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Zuiches, James J. and David L. Brown
1978 "The Changing Character of the Nonmetropolitan Population, 1960-1975" in Thomas Ford (ed.), Rural U.S.A. Persistence and Change. Ames, Iowa: Iowa State University.

Table 1. Farming, Forestry, and Fishing Occupations in the 1980 Decennial Census

| Census Code | |
|---|---|
| | Farm Operators and Managers |
| W(473) | Farmers, except horticultural |
| 474 | Horticultural specialty farmers |
| * 475 | Managers, farms, except horticultural |
| * 476 | Managers, horticultural specialty farms |
| | Other Agricultural and Related Occupations |
| | Farm Occupations, Except Managerial |
| * 477 | Supervisors, farm workers |
| * 479 | Farm workers |
| 483 | Marine life cultivation workers |
| * 484 | Nursery workers |
| | Related Agricultural Occupations |
| 485 | Supervisors, related agricultural occupations |
| 486 | Groundskeepers and gardeners, except farm |
| 487 | Animal caretakers, except farm |
| 488 | Graders and sorters, agricultural products |
| 489 | Inspectors, agricultural products |
| | Forestry and Logging Occupations |
| 494 | Supervisors, forestry and logging workers |
| 495 | Forestry workers, except logging |
| 496 | Timber cutting and logging occupations |
| | Fishers, Hunters, and Trappers |
| 497 | Captains and other officers, fishing vessels |
| 498 | Fishers |
| 499 | Hunters and trappers |

* Indicates categories included in definition of hired farmworker used in this paper. Unpaid family workers would be removed from these categories. Some graders and sorters (488) would be included in this definition if they did this work o the farm, but the majority of this type of work is done off the farm.

Table 2— Employment Profile of Hired Farmworkers Working in March and at Other Times of the Year, 1981

| Variables | Mean Values | | | F-Ratio |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Total Workers | March Workers | Other Workers | |
| Total Earnings (dol.) | 4,755 | 6,979 | 3,448 | 254.1 ** |
| Farm Earnings (dol.) | 2,924 | 6,079 | 1,071 | 1109.00 ** |
| Nonfarm Earnings (dol.) 1/ | 4,308 | 3,697 | 4,472 | |
| Dependency Rate (pct.) 2/ | 71 | 89 | 61 | 225.60 ** |
| Days of Farmwork Per Year | 105 | 218 | 39 | 2379.00 ** |
| Days of Nonfarm Work Per Year 1/ | 130 | 101 | 137 | |
| Major Activity: | | | | |
| Hired Farmwork | .32 | .71 | .09 | 1223.00 ** |
| Nonfarm Work | .19 | .09 | .25 | 69.10 ** |
| Not in Labor Force | .44 | .14 | .56 | 370.3 ** |
| Crop or Livestock Activity: | | | | |
| Field | .49 | .35 | .56 | 76.54 ** |
| Fruit & Vegetable | .23 | .23 | .23 | .78 |
| Livestock & Dairy | .20 | .33 | .12 | 119.10 ** |
| N | 1718 | 636 | 1082 | |

** Indicates significance at the 1 percent level.
* Indicates significance at the 5 percent level.

1/ Based on 730 Cases where individuals did both farm and nonfarm work during the year.
2/ Defined as proportion of total earnings received from farmwork.

Table 3— Demographic Profile of Hired Farmworkers Working in March and at Other Times of the Year, 1981

| Variables | Mean Values | | | F-Ratio |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Total Workers | March Workers | Other Workers | |
| Age (years) | 30.33 | 34.36 | 28.01 | 72.89 ** |
| Education (years) | 10.13 | 9.61 | 10.44 | 22.06 ** |
| Minority Status (minority = 1) | .28 | .35 | .24 | 19.74 ** |
| Household Status (head = 1) | .48 | .67 | .37 | 143.10 ** |
| Sex (male = 1) | .77 | .89 | .71 | 69.65 ** |
| Region: | | | | |
| North Central | .27 | .21 | .31 | 17.19 ** |
| South | .41 | .43 | .39 | 2.77 |
| West | .25 | .29 | .23 | 5.58 * |
| Residence (nonfarm = 1) | .83 | .76 | .87 | 35.35 ** |
| Home ownership | .55 | .45 | .61 | 38.70 ** |
| Low Income Status (low income = 1) | .31 | .31 | .31 | .23 |
| N | 1718 | 636 | 1082 | |

** Indicates significance at the 1 percent level.
* Indicates significance at the 5 percent level.

Table 4. Discriminant Analysis of Farmworkers in March and in All Other Months

| Variables | Standarized Discriminant Coefficients |
|---|---|
| Farm Earnings | .473 |
| Hired Farmwork as Chief Activity | .461 |
| Residence in South | .237 |
| Work with Field Crops | -.202 |
| Dependency Rate | .168 |
| Not in Labor Force as Chief Activity | -.149 |
| Age | .111 |
| Residence in North Central Region | .104 |
| Work with Livestock & Dairy | .084 |
| Education | .078 |
| Work with Fruits & Vegetables | -.075 |
| Sex (male=1) | .067 |
| Nonfarm Residence | .048 |
| Low Income Status | -.045 |
| Household Status (head=1) | .044 |
| | |
| Eigenvalue | 1.014 |
| Canonical Correlation | .716 |
| Wilks Lambda | .488 |
| $X^2$ for lambda | 1226.3 |
| Probability Level | $p > .01$ |
| | |
| Group Centroids | |
| March Workers | 1.34 |
| Other Month Workers | -.79 |
| | |
| Percent of Grouped Cases Correctly Classified | 84.5 |